

DISCLAIMER: In accordance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information of individuals, including public complainants and persons who were the subject of the investigation.

DE-IDENTIFIED SUMMARY UNDER SECTION 167(2) OF THE CSPA

Original Police Service:

Date of Complaint: 09/15/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service:

Referred to Other Service:

Retained by LECA:

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On August 8, 2025, the complainant alleged while in custody with [Redacted] Police he was not given a chance to go to the toilet. Before he was transported, he was told he could urinate, however, 4 officers stood around him and watched him, whereby he could not urinate.

He was then transported to a hospital and during the trip the transporting officer was described as being a bully and he was enjoying the fact the complainant was under pressure and in pain as he was keeping himself from peeing inside the vehicle. When they arrived at the hospital, the complainant told the officer sarcastically to “take your time man”. The officer responded “sure man you said it yourself I’ ll take my time now” while laughing with another officer.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Community Safety and Police Act, 2019

Allegation 1 - Performance of Duties - Section 19

A police officer shall not by act or omission, fail to perform their duties appropriately without lawful excuse if, at the time, they know or reasonably ought to know that their act or omission would amount to a failure to perform their duties appropriately.

Allegation 2 - Interactions with the Public - Section 10(1)

A police officer shall not conduct themselves in a manner that undermines, or is likely to undermine, public trust in policing.

Decision and Reasons

Allegation 1 - Performance of Duties - Section 19

It was determined that the apprehension of the complainant was lawful as there were concerns for his safety. In review of the Mental Health Act, section 17(c), it was found the officers were acting within their authority to apprehend the complainant and these grounds were later bolstered when a Doctor later placed the complainant on a Form 1 at the hospital.

The complainant had to urinate and advised the respondent and witness officers. As they had an obligation to ensure the complainant's safety, the officers allowed the complainant a suitable area, given the circumstances, where he could urinate before he was handcuffed and transported. The complainant was offered over a minute to complete this and made no attempt to urinate. The respondent and witness officers were found to have followed [Redacted] Procedure LE 016 - Prisoner Care and Control and Prisoner Transport (section C(10)).

Although the complainant did voice during transport he needed to urinate and was noticeably uncomfortable, the respondent officer was found to have expressed concern and updated the complainant numerous times during the trip to the hospital. In Car Camera (ICC) footage corroborated this showing the respondent officer, giving time and traffic updates and asked how the complainant was doing. The recording also captured the complainant give verbal indications that he was okay until they arrived at the hospital. The respondent officer also weighed other options of stopping at a commercial location or a secure police facility, but it was determined the safest and fastest way to get the complainant to the hospital was driving there directly.

When the respondent officer arrived at the hospital the complainant believed he was delayed with getting to a bathroom. ICC showed that the respondent officer was following procedure [Redacted] to advise communications of his end miles and to wait for a second officer to assist him. It took approximately 1 minute from the time of arrival to the time the complainant was brought to a washroom.

It was therefore determined that the respondent officer did not purposefully or intentionally cause the complainant any pain or discomfort and did not violate his Section 12 Charter rights, thus the allegation was unsubstantiated.

Allegation 2 - Interactions with the Public - Section 10(1)

In review of the ICC footage, it was determined that the respondent officer was found to be polite and professional during the transport of the complainant to the hospital. He asked if the complainant was okay, gave time updates and stated to the complainant that nobody wanted the complainant to pee himself and he would not let that happen.

In review of the entire interaction that the respondent officer and fellow witness officers had with the complainant, it was determined that the officers showed concern for the complainant and wanted to ensure he got the care he required.

When the respondent officer arrived at the hospital, the complainant admittedly stated sarcastically "Oh, take your time please". The respondent officer sarcastically responded "Okay if you want me to take my time, I'll take my time". The respondent officer later on was also heard lightly laughing when he was directing the witness officer to open the door.

From review of the ICC, the sarcastic response from the respondent officer was separate from the light laughter when the door was opened by the witness officer. At no time was the witness officer involved in the light laughter.

It was determined that the sarcastic response and later a moment of light laughter were ill-timed and inappropriate by the respondent officer, but did not constitute misconduct. It was determined that there was no delay in actually getting the complainant to a washroom when they arrived at the hospital and thus the allegation was unsubstantiated.